

## A New Role for Reagan: More Active Participant

Continued From Page 1

serious threat to the message and make a "considered response."

The senior official, an aide, and interpreting Mr. Reagan's speech and messages to Middle East leaders, carefully avoided any threat to use military or economic aid to Israel or the Arabs as "leverage."

Instead, he argued that the prospect of Israel peace might be the most persuasive argument and weapon available to the Administration.

The official said the dramatic events in Lebanon had made it "time to take the initiative" in the Middle East and to spell out clearly what the United States wanted.

The speech showed that at least some of the Middle East peace process was an attempt to ease anger in Israel.

The President did not speak of "self-determination" for the Palestinians, which Prime Minister Menachem Begin has rejected, but of the "legitimate rights" of the Palestinians, a phrase that Mr. Begin once grudgingly accepted.

But Israeli foreign policy experts will probably remain skeptical of any recovery for days as they pick over Mr. Reagan's text.

One of many examples was a call for "full" autonomy for Palestinians in the West Bank. Mr. Begin's Government has strongly opposed limited autonomy and continued Israeli control of public lands and water.

The President, however, does not intend to "deviate" from the ideas he advanced tonight; the senior official asserted.

President Reagan's suggestions, as outlined in his speech and contained in his letter to Prime Minister Begin, were meant to surmount the major obstacles to an Israeli-Arab settlement. In some cases, it was not immediately clear how the suggestions would be done.

The Camp David talks in September 1978 resulted in "frameworks" for returning the Sinai Peninsula to Egypt and negotiating the status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Israel captured the West Bank from Jordan and the Gaza Strip from Egypt in 1967.

A formal Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty was signed in Washington in March 1979. For the most part, it followed the Sinai framework.

The West Bank-Gaza framework called for the speedy election of Palestinian councils that would exercise a degree of local autonomy in the territories. The councils were also to provide representatives to take part in talks with envoys from Egypt, Israel, Jordan and the United States on the final legal status of the territories. The talks were to be concluded within five years of the formation of the councils.

### Jordan Rejects Accords

King Hussein of Jordan was consulted by telephone from Camp David, but did not agree then or later to participate in such negotiations. No local Palestinians have ever agreed to run the territories, and no councils have been formed.

United States and Egyptian officials interpreted the Camp David accords as freezing Israeli settlements in the West Bank at the levels that existed in September 1978.

Mr. Begin strongly disputed this interpretation, saying Israel had agreed to halt settlement only until the Palestinian autonomy councils had been elected and the four-party negotiations on the future of the occupied areas had begun.

At a third round of talks, the Israelis accepted a relatively brief one.

In the continuing statement, Israel had significantly increased the number of Jewish settlements in the West Bank and population of Jewish settlements, which now contain about 25,000 Jews.

The Carter Administration had grudgingly accepted the position that such settle-



President Reagan arriving by helicopter at TV studio in Burbank, Calif.

ments were "illegal," contending that they violated the Geneva Convention on the treatment of civilians in wartime and in occupied areas. The convention forbids the movement of civilians within occupied territories and the transfer of civilians from one territory to another.

Although President Reagan avoided expressing an opinion on the "legality" of the Jewish settlements until now, he had said that they were not helpful efforts to reach a peace settlement.

Mr. Begin almost ended the Camp David negotiations by saying that the Palestinians "framework" refer to the right of "self-determination" for the residents of the territories.

He grudgingly accepted the phrase-

"legitimate rights" of the Palestinians, but he said, in effect, that it was meaningless.

### A Voice for Palestinians

Secretary Shultz, in an Aug. 22 appearance on the NBC news program "Meet the Press," used the words "legitimate rights."

He said he had learned that the words "self-determination" had "come to be the equivalent of a Palestinian state, which has a lot of implications about military forces and many other things."

He said that "the main point is that the Palestinian people have a voice in determining the conditions under which they are governed."

He said that "the main point is that the Palestinian people have a voice in determining the conditions under which they are governed."

## Reagan Urges Jordan Link In Self-Rule by Palestinians

Continued From Page 1

necessary to encourage wider support for the peace process."

In his remarks, Mr. Reagan reaffirmed "ironclad" American support for Israel and the Camp David peace process. But, Administration officials said, the speech also marked his determination to expand the context of the Camp David plan beyond the narrow definition favored by Israel and to introduce into the peace process some "new ideas" strongly resisted by Israel.

One adviser said of Mr. Reagan's warning to Israel on its conduct in occupied territories, "He's saying to Israel that this is the key to the Arabs coming into the peace process."

White House aides said Mr. Reagan's speech, delivered at 9 P.M. E.D.T., had been under preparation for some time. But it was decided "rather abruptly" today to deliver it after news reports of Israel of a letter of warning from Mr. Reagan to Prime Minister Menachem Begin about the occupied territories.

The news reports caused an adverse reaction in Israel. So a Reagan aide said Mr. Reagan decided to spell out his full position and "get it on the record without having to be reactive about it."

Referring to the evacuation of Palestinian Liberation Organization troops from West Beirut, Mr. Reagan said that he expected the Marine contingent in the peacekeeping force there to leave the country within two weeks. "It seemed to me," he added, "that with the agreement in Lebanon, we had an opportunity for a more far-reaching peace effort in the region, and it was determined to get that momentum."

As a result, the President said, he had conducted a series of confidential talks about initiatives that the United States might undertake in the region. "The

Lebanon war, tragic as it was, has left us with a new opportunity for Middle East peace," the President said, speaking of his determination to "resolve the root causes of conflict between Arabs and Israelis."

"The question," Mr. Reagan continued, "is how to reconcile Israel's legitimate security concerns with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians." Mr. Reagan then made it clear that he favors the five-year process prescribed in the 1978 Camp David accord to bring autonomy to Palestinians on the West Bank. That process has never begun because of Mr. Begin's misgivings about it and continued resistance to it by the P.L.O. and by Jordan.

Mr. Reagan tonight called for beginning of the autonomy process and also for an unspecified supervisory role for Jordan that seemed designed to satisfy Jordan's desire for a role in the territory that it regards, historically, as its own.

"The purpose of the five-year period of transition which would begin after free elections for a self-governing Palestinian authority is to prove to the Palestinians that they can run their own affairs, and that such Palestinian autonomy poses no threat to Israel's security," Mr. Reagan said.

Then, Mr. Reagan asserted, in recognition of Israel's concerns, that the "United States will not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza."

"There is," he concluded, "another way to peace." He called for negotiations in line with the American view that "self-government by the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza in association with Jordan offers the best chance for a durable, just and lasting peace."

## Text of Reagan's Address to Nation on the West Bank and the Palestinians

BURBANK, Calif., Sept. 1 (AP) — Following is the prepared text of President Reagan's speech tonight on the Middle East, as issued here by the White House:

Today has been a day that should make all of us proud. It marked the beginning of the successful peace process in the Middle East. This peaceful step could never have been taken without the good offices of the United States and the leadership of the truly heroic work of a great American diplomat, Ambassador Philip Habib. Thanks to his efforts, we have announced that the U.S. Marine contingent helping to supervise the evacuation of P.L.O. forces from Beirut will be withdrawn by the end of the month. Our young men should be out of Lebanon within two weeks. They too, have served the cause of peace and justice, and we can all be very proud of them.

But the situation in Lebanon is only part of the overall problem of conflict in the Middle East. So, over the past two weeks, while events in Beirut dominated the front page, America was engaged in a quiet, behind-the-scenes effort to lay the groundwork for a broader peace in the region. For once, there were no premature leaks as U.S. diplomatic missions traveled to Middle East capitals and I met with leaders of the private sector to help map out an American peace initiative for the long-suffering peoples of the Middle East, Arab and Israeli alike.

It seemed to me that, with the agreement in Lebanon, we had an opportunity for a more far-reaching peace effort in the region and I was determined to seize that moment. In the words of the scriptures, the time had come to "follow after the things which make for peace."

Tonight, I want to report to you on the steps we have taken, and the prospects they can open up for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

America has long been committed to bringing peace to this troubled region. For more than a generation, successive U.S. administrations have endeavored to develop a fair and workable process that could lead to a true and lasting Arab-Israeli peace. Our involvement in the search for Middle East peace is not a matter of preference, it is a moral imperative. The strategic importance of the region to the U.S. is well known.

But our policy is motivated by more than strategic interests. We also have an irreversible commitment to the survival and territorial integrity of friendly states. Nor can we ignore the fact that the well-being of much of the world's economy is tied to stability in the strife-torn Middle East. Our traditional humanitarian concerns dictate a continuing effort to peacefully resolve conflict in this region.

Following Predecessors' Lead: When our Administration assumed office in January 1981, I decided that the general framework for our Middle East policy should follow the broad guidelines laid down by my predecessors.

There were two basic issues we had to address. First, there was the strategic threat to the region posed by the Soviet Union and its surrogates, best demonstrated by the brutal war in Afghanistan; and second, the peace process between Israel and its Arab neighbors. With regard to the Soviet threat, we have strengthened our efforts to develop with our friends and allies a joint policy to deter the Soviet Union and their surrogates from further expansion in the region, and, if necessary, to defend against it.

With respect to the Arab-Israeli conflict, we have embraced the Camp David framework as the only way to proceed. We have also recognized, however, that solving the Arab-Israeli conflict, in and of itself, cannot assure peace throughout a region as vast and troubled as the Middle East.

Our first objective under the Camp David process was to insure the successful completion of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty. This was achieved with the peaceful return of the Sinai to Egypt in April 1982. To accomplish this, we worked hard with our Egyptian and Israeli friends, and eventually with other friendly countries, to create the multinational force which now operates in the Sinai.

Throughout this period of difficult and time-consuming negotiations, we never lost sight of the next step of Camp David: autonomy talks to pave the way for a permanent peace. We announced that we would permit the Palestinians to exercise their legitimate rights. However, owing to the tragic assassination of President Sadat and the crisis in the area, we did not until January 1982 that we were able to make a major effort to renew these talks. Secretary of State Haig and Ambassador Fairbank made three visits to Israel and Egypt this year to continue the process. As a result, significant progress was made in developing the basic outline of an American approach to the peace process. We presented to Egypt and Israel after Camp David the successful completion of Israel's withdrawal from Sinai and the measures shown on this occasion by Prime Minister Begin and President Mubarak in living up to their agreement to continue the peace process.

Now, we have a new American policy to try to bridge the remaining differences between the Israelis and the Palestinians. So, in May, I called for specific measures and a timetable for the continuation of the peace process. The time has come for the next steps in the peace process. However, before this effort could be launched, the conflict in Lebanon had re-emerged, our efforts. The autonomy talks were basically put on hold while we sought to untangle the parties in Lebanon and still the guns of war.

### New Opportunity for Peace

The Lebanon war, tragic as it was, has left us with a new opportunity for Middle East peace. We must seize it now and bring peace to this troubled area as a vital step in the peace process. It is now still time. It was with this strong conviction that over a month ago, before the present negotiations in Beirut had been completed, I directed Secretary of State Shultz to again review our policy and to acquire a wide range of outstanding Americans on the best ways to strengthen chances for peace in the Middle East.

We have consulted with many of the officials who were historically involved in the process, with members of the Congress, and with individuals from the private sector. The fact that I have held extensive consultations with my own advisers on the principles I will outline tonight is a testament to the importance of this process.

The evacuation of the P.L.O. from Beirut is now complete. And we can now help the Lebanese to rebuild their war-torn country. We owe it to ourselves, and to posterity, to move quickly to build upon this achievement. A stable and revived Lebanon is essential to all our hopes for peace in the region. The people of Lebanon deserve the best efforts of the international community to turn the nightmare of the past several years into a new dawn of hope.

But the opportunities for peace in the Middle East do not begin and end in Lebanon. As we help Lebanon to build, we must also move to resolve the root causes of conflict between the Arabs and the Israelis.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated many things, but two concerns me most. We have always recognized, and continue to recognize, that the only voluntary agreement of those parties most directly involved in the conflict can provide an enduring solution. But it has become evident to me that some clearer sense of America's position on the key issues is necessary to encourage wider support for the peace process.

First, the military losses of the P.L.O. have not diminished the yearning of the Palestinian people for a just solution of their claims. And second, while Israel's military successes in Lebanon have demonstrated that its armed forces are second to none in the region, they alone cannot bring just

and lasting peace to Israel and her neighbors.

One question now is how to reconcile Israel's legitimate security concerns with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. And that answer can only come at the negotiating table. Each party must recognize that the outcome must be acceptable to all and that true peace will require compromises by all.

### First Step Needed in Region

So, tonight I am calling for a fresh start. This is the moment at which we are directly concerned to get involved — or lend their support — to a workable and lasting peace. The Camp David agreement remains the foundation of our policy. Its language provides all parties with the leeway they need for successful negotiations.

I call on Israel to make clear that the security for which they yearn can only be achieved through genuine peace, a peace requiring magnanimity, vision and courage.

In making these calls upon others to recognize that their own political aspirations are inextricably bound to the recognition of Israel's right to a secure future.

I call on the Arab states to accept the reality of Israel, and the reality that peace and justice are to be gained only through hard, fair, direct negotiation.

In making these calls upon others, I recognize that the United States has a special responsibility. No other nation is in a position to deal with the key parties to the conflict on the basis of trust and reliability.

The time has come for a new realism on the part of all the peoples of the Middle East. The State of Israel is an accomplished fact; it is not a challenge to be challenged. Legitimacy within the community of nations. But Israel's legitimacy has thus far been recognized by no court, and has been denied by every Arab state except Egypt. Israel exists; it has a right to demand of its neighbors that they recognize those facts.

The war in Lebanon has demonstrated another reality in the region. The departure of the Palestinians from Beirut dramatizes more than ever the homelessness of the Palestinian people. Palestinians feel strongly that their cause is more than a question of refugees. I agree. The Camp David agreement recognized that fact when it spoke of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people and their just requirements. For peace to endure, it must involve all those who have been most directly affected by the conflict. Only through broader participation in the peace process, most immediately by Jordan and by the Palestinians, will Israel be able to rest content in the knowledge that its security and integrity will be respected by its neighbors. Only through the process of negotiation can all the nations of the Middle East achieve a secure peace.

These then are our general goals. What are the specific new American positions, and why are we taking these steps?

In the Camp David talks this year, both Israel and Egypt have felt free to express openly their views as to what the outcome should be. Understandably, their views have differed on many points.

### U.S. Role as Mediator

The United States has thus far sought to play the role of mediator. We have avoided public comment on the key issues. We have always recognized, and continue to recognize, that the only voluntary agreement of those parties most directly involved in the conflict can provide an enduring solution. But it has become evident to me that some clearer sense of America's position on the key issues is necessary to encourage wider support for the peace process.

First, the military losses of the P.L.O. have not diminished the yearning of the Palestinian people for a just solution of their claims. And second, while Israel's military successes in Lebanon have demonstrated that its armed forces are second to none in the region, they alone cannot bring just

and lasting peace to Israel and her neighbors. One question now is how to reconcile Israel's legitimate security concerns with the legitimate rights of the Palestinians. And that answer can only come at the negotiating table. Each party must recognize that the outcome must be acceptable to all and that true peace will require compromises by all.

The purpose of the five-year period of transition which would begin after free elections for a self-governing Palestinian authority is to prove to the Palestinians that they can run their own affairs, and that such Palestinian autonomy poses no threat to Israel's security.

The United States will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements during the transition period. Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlement freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed for wider participation in these talks.

Further settlement activity is, in no way necessary for the security of Israel, and it only diminishes the confidence of the Arabs that a final outcome can be freely and fairly negotiated.

I want to make the American position clear: The purpose of this transition period is the peaceful and orderly transfer of domestic authority from Israel to the Palestinian inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza. At the same time, such a transfer must not interfere with Israel's security requirements.

Beyond the transition period, as we look to the future of the West Bank and Gaza, it is clear to me that peace cannot be achieved by the formation of an independent Palestinian state in those territories. Nor is it achievable on the basis of Israeli sovereignty or permanent control over the West Bank and Gaza.

So the United States will not support the establishment of an independent Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza, and we will not support any form of permanent control over the West Bank and Gaza.

### Jordan Role in West Bank

There is, however, another way to peace. The final status of these lands must, of course, be reached through the give-and-take of negotiations. But it is the firm view of the United States that self-government by the Palestinians of the West Bank and Gaza in association with Jordan offers the best chance for a durable, just and lasting peace.

We base our approach squarely on the principle that the Arab-Israeli conflict could be resolved through negotiations involving an exchange of territory for peace. This exchange is defined in United Nations Security Council Resolution 242, which is, in turn, incorporated in all its parts in the Camp David agreement. The U.S. Resolution 242 remains wholly valid as the foundation stone of America's policy in the Middle East.

"It is the United States' position that — in return for peace — the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the territories to all fronts, including the West Bank and Gaza."

"When the border is negotiated between Jordan and Israel, our view on the extent to which Israel should be asked to give up territory will be based on the extent to which Israel's security and normalization and the security arrangements offered in return."

Finally, we remain convinced that Jerusalem must remain undivided, but its final status should be decided through negotiations.

In the course of the negotiations to come, the United States will support positions that seem to us fair and reasonable compromises, and likely to promote a sound agreement. We will also put forward our own detailed proposals when we believe they can be helpful.

And, make no mistake, the United States will oppose any proposal — from any party and at any point in the negotiating process — that threatens the security of Israel. America's commitment to the security of Israel is ironclad.

During the past few days, our Ambassadors in Israel, Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have presented to their host governments the proposals in full detail that I have outlined here tonight.

I am convinced that these proposals can bring justice, bring security and bring durability to an Arab-Israeli peace.

The United States will stand by these principles with total dedication. They are fully consistent with Israel's security requirements and the aspirations of the Palestinians. It will work hard to broaden participation at the peace table as envisaged by the Camp David accords. And I fervently hope that the Palestinians and Jordan, with the support of their Arab colleagues, will accept this opportunity.

Conflict a Threat to World: Tragic turmoil in the Middle East runs back to the dawn of history. In our modern day, conflict after conflict has taken its brutal toll there. In an age of nuclear challenges and economic interdependence, such conflicts are a threat to all the people of the world, not just the Middle East itself. It is time for us all, in the Middle East and around the world, to call to halt to conflict, hatred and prejudice; it is

time for us all to launch a common effort for reconstruction, peace and progress.

It has often been said — and regrettably too often been true — that the cause of the search for peace and justice in the Middle East is a tragedy of opportunities missed.

But the death of the settlement in Lebanon we now face an opportunity for a broader peace. This time we must not let it slip from our grasp. We must look beyond the difficulties and obstacles of the present and move with fairness and resolve toward a brighter future. We owe it to ourselves, and to posterity, to do no less.

For if we miss this chance to make a fresh start, we may look back on this moment from some later vantage point and realize how much that failure cost us.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.

These, then, are the principles upon which American policy towards the Arab-Israeli conflict will be based. I have made a personal commitment to see that they endure and, God willing, that they will come to be seen by all reasonable, compassionate people as fair, achievable, and in the interests of all who wish to see peace in the Middle East.

Tonight, on the eve of what can be a dawn of new hope for the people of the troubled Middle East — and for all the world's people who dream of a just and peaceful future — I ask you, my fellow Americans, for your support and your prayers in this great undertaking.